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|  | Student did not  submit the assignment.  #9 | |
| **Due Date: Thursday, December 15th** | **Student Name:**  **Course Name:**  **Period:**  **Teacher Name:** | |
| **Assignment Title:** | **You Be the Judge** | |
| **Assignment Summary:** | We have been studying the components of a proof and the necessary steps to building a sound argument. This is an essential set of skills for argumentation and logical reasoning in other contexts besides geometry class. In this paper, you will analyze a set of “proofs” that might be put forth in a court of law.  **Paragraph 1: SUMMARIZE**   * Summarize the scenario according to what both parties agree on.   **Paragraph 2: POSTULATES**   * Identify geometric postulates used in Proofs (A-1) and (B-1) and whether or not they were used correctly.   **Paragraph 3: Argue FOR**   * Make a ruling and justify it by supporting the plaintiff’s proofs (A-1 and A-2) or the defendant’s proofs (B-1 and B-2). * Note: you MUST choose a side, you cannot grant both rulings.   **Paragraph 4: Argue AGAINST**   * Justify your ruling by arguing against the plaintiff’s proofs (A-1 and A-2) or against the defendant’s proofs (B-1 and B-2). * Note: you MUST choose the same ruling as in paragraph 3, only now you are doing it by arguing against the ruling you did not pick. | |
| **Role:** | You are the judge in this case. You are presenting your ruling to the court after careful deliberation and justify your decision based on analysis of the individual proofs. | |
| **Audience:** | Your audience is the members of the court, including the defendant and plaintiff, as well as Ms. Thai, Ms. Ziegler, and Ms. McOsker who are sitting in the benches in the courtroom. | |
| **Format:** | * **Typed, 1-inch margins, double spaced** * No excessive spacing of lines or margins * MLA format heading * Minimum length: 1.5 pages   (Inadequate length will result in a letter-grade drop) | * Include your own creative title * Staple assignment sheet to front of final draft; staple rough draft to back of final draft * Indent the beginning of each paragraph |
| **Procedure:** | 1. Brainstorm 2. Write first draft 3. Self edit 4. Peer edit 5. Make revisions based on editing 6. Proofread 7. Print final draft | |

Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Exceeding** | **Meeting** | **Approaching** | **Baseline** | **Unacceptable** | **Points** |
| Content/CRS Expectations: | \_\_Identifies at least two postulates  \_\_Articulates whether or not used accurately  \_\_Offers a correction that would make the argument sound  20 | \_\_Identifies at least two postulates  \_\_Articulates whether or not used accurately  15 | \_\_Identifies at least one postulate  \_\_Incorrectly addresses accuracy of postulates  10 | \_\_Identifies at least one postulate  \_\_Does not address accuracy of postulates  5 | \_\_Does not identify postulates  \_\_Does not address accuracy of postulates  0 | \_\_\_\_ / 20 |
| **PLAINTIFF**  \_\_Greater emphasis on P’s logical defense  **And one of the following:**  \_\_Provides a correction to P’s offense that would make it logical **or**  \_\_Provides a correction to D’s defense that would make it logical  40 | All three of the following are argued:  \_\_Greater emphasis on P’s logical defense  \_\_Recognize P’s offense is illogical  \_\_Addresses why D’s defense is illogical  30 | Missing one of the following or weakly argued:  \_\_Greater emphasis on P’s logical defense  \_\_Recognize P’s offense is illogical  \_\_Addresses that the D’s offense is illogical  20 | Missing two of the following or weakly argued:  \_\_Greater emphasis on P’s logical defense  \_\_Recognize P’s offense is illogical  \_\_Addresses that the D’s offense is illogical  10 | Missing all of the following or weakly argued:  \_\_Greater emphasis on P’s logical defense  \_\_Recognize P’s offense is illogical  \_\_Addresses that the D’s offense is illogical  0 | \_\_\_\_ / 40 |
| **DEFENDANT**  \_\_Greater emphasis on D’s logical offense  **And one of the following:**  \_\_Provides a correction to D’s defense that would make it logical **or**  \_\_Provides a correction to P’s offense that would make it logical  40 | All three of the following are argued:  \_\_Greater emphasis on D’s logical offense  \_\_Recognize D’s defense is illogical  \_\_Addresses why P’s offense is illogical  30 | Missing one of the following or weakly argued:  \_\_Greater emphasis on D’s logical offense  \_\_Recognize D’s defense is illogical  \_\_Addresses why P’s offense is illogical  20 | Missing two of the following or weakly argued:  \_\_Greater emphasis on D’s logical offense  \_\_Recognize D’s defense is illogical  \_\_Addresses why P’s offense is illogical  10 | Missing all of the following or weakly argued:  \_\_Greater emphasis on D’s logical offense  \_\_Recognize D’s defense is illogical  \_\_Addresses why P’s offense is illogical  0 | \_\_\_\_ / 40 |
| Writing Expectations: | Uses correct spelling and capitalization throughout the entire essay. (Fewer than 4 errors) | Uses mostly correct spelling and capitalization throughout the entire essay. (4-6 errors) | Makes several errors on spelling and capitalization. (6-8 errors) | Spelling and capitalization errors make it difficult to read portions of the essay. (8-10 errors) | Spelling and capitalization errors are apparent in most sentences throughout the essay. (over 10 errors) | \_\_\_\_ / 20 |
| Uses commas correctly throughout the entire essay. (Fewer than 2 errors) | Uses commas correctly throughout most of the essay.  (2- 4 errors) | Makes several comma errors throughout the essay. ( 4-6 errors) | Makes so many comma errors throughout the essay that the reader is distracted from the content of the essay. ( 6-8 errors) | Commas are never used correctly in the essay. (over 8 errors) | \_\_\_\_ / 20 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total: \_\_\_\_\_ / 100 | |